

## REMARKS

1. Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 41 is amended per the examiner's suggestion made in the final office action.

2. Claims 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,487,170 to Bass et al. Claims 11 and 13 are amended essentially as suggested by the examiner in the advisory action.

3. Claims 12, 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bass in view of U.S. patent no. 5,167,022 to Bahr et al. Claims 30, 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bass in view of U.S. patent no. 4,847,751 to Nakade et al. Claims 31-33, 37-39, 41-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bass in view of Nakade and U.S. patent no. 5,386,517 to Sheth et al.

Similar rejections had been made in the office action dated January 3, 2008. That office action also rejected claims 34, 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bass in view of Nakade, Sheth and U.S. patent no. 5,592,654 to Djakovic, but the rejection of claims 34, 40 was not repeated in the final office action.

Claims 12, 30-33, 35-39, 41-42 each depend from claim 11 or 13. Bahr, Nakade, and Sheth were cited as teaching features recited in these dependent claims. These features do not overcome the deficiency of Bass as discussed hereinabove with respect to Claims 11 and 13.

4. New claims 43-44 depend from claim 11. Claims 45-46 depend from claim 13. Claims 44, 46 are supported by the specification, page 4, line 28 through page 5, line (each task accesses the request FIFO resource and then the command FIFO resource to process a frame).

5. New claim 47 includes language similar to claim 11, but in the last paragraph recites that after the task T1 has finished accessing the resource R1, the circuit "does not allow the task T1 to access the resource R1 until the circuit obtains an indication of one or more conditions including a condition that every task other than T1 has finished accessing the resource R1 after the task T1 accessed the resource R1".

One embodiment of claim 47 is illustrated in Fig. 4. Task 0 is shown as connected by switch “a” to a resource called “Request FIFO” (the switch is a conceptual representation of Task 0 owning the Request FIFO). The specification page 19 lines 14-18 explain that “When Task 0 accesses the request FIFO 230, switch “a” is flipped to connect the request FIFO to Task 1. Task 0 will not be allowed to read the request FIFO again until Task 1 has read the request FIFO”. Thus, the “indication” reads on the switch “a” being flipped back to the task T0.

Another embodiment is illustrated in the state diagram of Fig. 7 and specification pages 25-27, 44-45. The switch “a” corresponds to signal Ireqf (page 27, lines 16-18). If Ireqf is asserted, this indicates that the resource “Ingress Request FIFO” is owned by Task 1. If Ireqf is deasserted, this indicates that the Request FIFO is owned by Task 0.

When a task T0 or T1 attempts to read the FIFO but does not own the FIFO, the task moves from the Active state (Fig. 7) to the Suspend state.

From the Suspend state, the task moves to the Ready state (and then the Active state in which the task is allowed to access the FIFO) in response to a Release condition, and the “one or more conditions” of claim 47 can be read on the Release condition. For the Ingress Task 0 for example, the Release condition for the corresponding request FIFO is shown at the bottom of page 44 as:

Ireqf\_ & cfifordy[x]

The signal cfifordy[x] indicates a condition that the FIFO is not empty (page 26, last two lines). The signal Ireqf\_ indicates that Ireqf is deasserted, i.e. the Ingress Task 1 has finished accessing the FIFO and hence the FIFO is owned by Task 0.

6. Claim 47 distinguishes over Bass essentially as explained for claim 11 in the AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL OFFICE ACTION filed August 22, 2008, pages 6-8. The advisory action associated claim 11 with the time division access technique of Bass’ column 1 last paragraph. Claim 47 is believed to distinguish over this technique because Bass does not teach or suggest providing access “responsive” to an indication of “one or more conditions including a condition that every task other than T1 has finished accessing the resource...”, wherein “every task other than T1” includes a task T2 which “has not


attempted to access the resource” after the task T1 finished accessing the resource. In Bass, every task “is assigned a window of time and gets to execute during that window” (column 1 lines 53-54). If some task 0 of Bass finished accessing a resource and attempts to access the same resource again, task 0 will be allowed to access the resource in a corresponding window regardless of whether or not other tasks have accessed the resource. Thus, the task 0 access is not responsive to an indication of any other task having finished accessing the resource as recited in claim 47.

7. Claims 48-49 depend from claim 47.


8. Claim 50 and its depend claims 51-52 are believed to be allowable for reasons similar to the reasons given above for claim 47.

9. If a fee is required for this submission, please charge the fee or any underpayment thereof, or credit any overpayment, to deposit account 50-2257.

Any questions regarding this case can be addressed to the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's electronic filing system on September 30, 2008.	
	9-30-08
Attorney for Applicant(s)	Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael Shenker  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 34,250  
Telephone: (408) 392-9250

Law Offices Of  
MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP  
2033 Gateway Place, Suite 400  
San Jose, CA 95110